



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,786	08/01/2001	Brian Vosburgh	OR02-13701	5157

7590

07/14/2004

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 SECOND ST.
SUITE 201
DAVIS, CA 95616

EXAMINER

VO, TED T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/920,786

Applicant(s)

VOSBURGH, BRIAN

Examiner

Ted T. Vo

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment, the Declaration Under 37 CFR 1.131, and exhibitions containing Applicants' development reports, filed on 04/26/2004.

Claims 11 and 26 are amended. With respect to the amendment of Claims 11 and 26, the previous rejection under 35 USC 112 second paragraph is withdraw

Claims 1-61 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-6, 10-16, 18-21, 25-31, 33-36, 40-61 stand finally rejected under **35 U.S.C. 102(b)** as being anticipated by Rundensteiner et al., "Maintaining Data Warehouses Over Changing Information Sources", June 2000; and

Claims 2, 7-9, 17, 22-24, 32, 37-39 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rundensteiner et al, in view of Henning, (US No. 5,499,371).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicants' arguments in the Remarks filed on 4/26/04 have been fully considered. In the Remarks (pages 16-17), Applicants contend the submission of an enclosed declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 and a true copy of weekly reports covering the period January 3, 2000 to April 21, 2000 will establish a date of the invention before January 7, 2000 and a date of reduction to practice on or March 10, 2000 (Remarks: page 16). Applicants, hence, argue the submission overcomes the rejection of Rundensteiner, published in June 2000 (Remarks: page 17).

Examiner respectfully responds: The submission of Applicants included with the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 and the weekly status reports of Applicants cannot overcome the rejection under **35 U.S.C. 102(b)** -- 37 CFR 1.131(A).

MPEP 715: SITUATIONS WHERE 37 CFR 1.131 AFFIDAVITS OR DECLARATIONS ARE INAPPROPRIATE:

Art Unit: 2122

"An affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 is not appropriate in the following situations:

(A) Where the reference publication date is more than 1 year prior to applicant's or patent owner's effective filing date. Such a reference is a "statutory bar" under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as referenced in 37 CFR 1.131(a)(2). A reference that only qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) or (e) is not a "statutory bar."

Because the rejections of Claims 1, 3-6, 10-16, 18-21, 25-31, 33-36, 40-61 under **35 U.S.C. 102(b)** as being anticipated by Rundensteiner, is a "**statutory bar**", the filing of Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 is inappropriate and the submission of Applicants' weekly status reports does not antedate a reference or activity that qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

The Rejections of Claims 1, 3-6, 10-16, 18-21, 25-31, 33-36, 40-61 under **35 U.S.C. 102(b)** as being anticipated by Rundensteiner et al., "Maintaining Data Warehouses Over Changing Information Sources", June 2000, and Claims 2, 7-9, 17, 22-24, 32, 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rundensteiner et al, in view of Henning, (US No. 5,499,371), are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3-6, 10-16, 18-21, 25-31, 33-36, 40-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rundensteiner et al., "Maintaining Data Warehouses Over Changing Information Sources", ACM 2000.

Art Unit: 2122

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the specification.

As per claim 1:

Rundensteiner discloses, "maintaining data warehouses over changing information sources"

Where the term 'data warehouses' relates to relational or object oriented database system, and the term 'changing information sources' relates to XML documents.

Rundensteiner discloses translations between the native model of the sources (*XML document data*) and the data model of the data warehousing system (*object model*) by the means of wrappers (*mapping*). A specific translation is shown in figure 3 (page 60) by building the relational wrappers over XML datasets and mapping XML document type definitions into relational metadata (see page 3, left-hand column, section "Heterogeneous model information sources"). Thus relational metadata describes a relational model context (*object model*) as shown in Figure 3, and shows how data under type definitions of an XML document is laid out. The relational model context represents a schema/object model in the warehousing system.

Thus, Rundensteiner discloses,

"A method for mapping (See Figure 1, page 58, 'Wrapper') data in a markup language document (See Figure 1, 'XML', and see right-hand column (page 58), section "Data Warehousing Architecture", referring to line 9 of second paragraph, 'The native model of the source' (i.e. XML documents)) to an object model (See Figure 1, the relational 'RBBMS', and see right-hand column (page 58), in section "Data Warehousing Architecture": refer 'relational or object-oriented database systems' in lines 8-9 of first paragraph, and refer 'common model of the data warehouse system' in lines 9-10 of second paragraph or 'schema' in line 11 of second paragraph for the limitation 'object model'), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a mapping request for mapping data in a markup language document having data architecture into an object model (see page 58, right-hand column, section: "Data Warehousing Architecture", lines 12-13 of second paragraph, refer 'the mapping of query requests' for the limitation 'mapping request'); and

Art Unit: 2122

"mapping (See figure 3, page 60), in response to the mapping request, the data into the object model using mapping meta-data (see page 60, left-hand column, section "Heterogeneous model information sources": referring to "XML, and increasing popular format for information encoding and exchange, could be integrated by building relational wrappers over XML datasets by mapping XML Document type Definitions (DTD) into relational metadata") which defines how the data architecture of the markup language document maps to the object model" (See Figure 3, the left-hand rectangular box 'Mapping XML Document to Relation' associated with citation 'building relational wrappers over XML datasets by mapping XML Document type Definitions (DTD) into relational metadata' above shows how data from XML data file is laid out in the relational model context).

As per claim 3: Rundensteiner discloses:

"The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the markup language document has one or more elements (See figure 3, page 60, upper rectangular box: XML data file; and refer <address> for the limitation 'element') containing data (See Figure 3, in XML data file; refer 'Computer Science Dept' between tags <info> and </info> for 'data'), the object model has one or more object class (see figure 3, lower rectangular box: Relational model context. Refer 'Address' for 'object class'), each object class has one or more attributes (see Figure 3, in Relational model context, refer 'Id 1001' for 'attributes') that correspond to the elements,

and the step mapping includes a step of populating the attributes with the data of corresponding elements based on the mapping meta-data (see Figure 3, for example, data in XML data file <address> such as 'Computer Science Dept', is populated into the relational model context 'Address' based on XML Document Type Definitions an Relational Metadata).

As per claim 4: Rundensteiner discloses:

"The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the markup language document has one or more elements containing data, the object model has one or more object classes, each object class has one or more attributes that correspond to the elements and the step of mapping includes:

a step of generating a row structure corresponding to the markup language elements of the markup language document; (see Figure 3, page 60, the lower rectangular box, Relational model context,

'Address', is a row structure corresponding to the upper rectangular, XML data file. The Relational model context is built by 'Mapping XML');

a step of converting the row structure into one or more objects corresponding to the elements;
(see Figure 3, for example, the Relation model context 'Address' is one of other relational model contexts; Figure 2, page 59 shows another Relational model context 'Schema': Salaries); and

a step of populating attributes of the converted objects with the data of the elements based on the mapping metadata" (see Figure 3, for example, the Relational model context contains Id with an attribute value 1001, and other data such as 'Computer Science Dept').

As per claim 5: Rundensteiner discloses,

"The method as claimed in claim 3, wherein the markup language document further has at least one element (See figure 3, page 60, upper rectangular box: refer <address> for the limitation 'at least one element') containing one or more other elements (See figure 3, still refer <address> for the limitation 'one or more other elements') and the mapping step inserts, based on the mapping metadata, a value representing the relation between the at least one element and the one or more other elements into an attribute of the object model (See Figure 3, lower rectangular box: refer 'Id 1001' for 'an attribute of the object model') to represent a relationship between objects corresponding to the at least one element and the one or more other elements (The Id in this particular 'Relational model context' corresponds one attribute id, which is among one of other 'Addresses').

As per claim 6: Rundensteiner discloses

"The method as claimed in claim 5, wherein the at least one element (Figure 3, page 60, upper rectangular box: refer <address> for the name of 'one element') contains a single element (Figure 3: within <Address> </Address> is a single element/or multiple elements depend on the structure of XML data file) containing data (Figure 3, For example <state> MA </state>) and the mapping step inserts a value (Figure 3, referring to '1001') representing the relation between the at least one element and the single element into an attribute (ID) of the object model that represents a one-to-one relationship (Relational Model Context:'Address' is one-to-one relation to XML data file: <Address> 'element') between objects that correspond to the at least one element and the single element".

As per claim 10: Rundensteiner discloses,

"The method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising a step of obtaining the mapping meta-data prior to the mapping step" (see page 60, left-hand column, section "Heterogeneous model information sources", referring to, mapping XML Document type Definitions (DTD) into relational metadata, this means that the mapping is performed after the existence of relational metadata).

As per claim 11: (This claim is identified as being indefinite. It is interpreted in light of the specification) Rundensteiner discloses,

"The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the obtaining step is carried out during initialization of a system for executing the receiving step and the mapping step" (See page 57, see three bullets, 'At set up time...', 'During query processing time...', and 'During operation time,...'. This means that the maintaining data Warehouses includes initialization).

As per claim 12: Rundensteiner discloses,

"The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the markup language document has one or more elements, the object model has one or more object classes, and the mapping meta-data includes mapping information (Page 60, left-hand column, section "Heterogeneous model information sources", 'Relation metadata') regarding one of the elements and the corresponding object class" (See Figure 3, page 60, refer <address>, upper rectangular for 'one of the element', it is corresponding to 'Address', object class', in the lower rectangular box).

As per claim 13: Rundensteiner discloses,

"The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the markup language document has one or more elements, the object model has one or more object classes, each object class has one or more attributes, the mapping meta-data includes mapping information regarding one of the elements that contains data and the corresponding attribute, and the mapping step maps the data of the one of the elements into the corresponding attributes based on the mapping information" (See Figure 3, page 60, for example <info> Computer Science Dept </info> 'the data of the one of the elements' is mapped into the element 'Address' which is corresponding to 'attributes' Id 1001, based on the Mapping XML Document Relation).

As per claim 14: Rundensteiner discloses, "*The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the markup language document is a document in which each element is defined by indicators*"

(See Figure 3, page 60, for example, the upper rectangular is an element 'Address' defined by <Address> and </Address>).

As per claim 15: Rundensteiner discloses, "*The method as claimed in claim 14, wherein the markup language document is an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) document*" (See Figure 3, referring to "XML" data type file).

As per claim 16: In regard to claims limitation:

A method for mapping an object in an object model (See page 58, Figure 1, the relational 'RBBMS'), to a markup language document (See Figure 1, 'XML'), the method comprising the steps of:

With regards to "receiving a mapping request for mapping one or more objects of an object model into a markup language document having data architecture; and

mapping, in response to the mapping request, the objects into the markup language document using mapping meta-data which defines how the object model maps to data architecture of the markup language document"(see Figure 3, page 60, right-hand square box, "Dump Relations to XML Document"), the claim recites a method in which each steps is corresponding to the step recited in claim 1, except it is reversed from an object model to an XML document.

The rejection of claim 16 is in the same reason set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 1, provided in Figure 3, page 60, right-hand square box, "Dump Relations to XML Document".

As per claim 18:

The claim recites a method in which each step is corresponding to the step recited in claim 3. It expresses a reversed mapping from an object model to an XML document.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection of claim 18 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 3.

As per claim 19:

The claim recites a method in which each step is corresponding to the step recited in claim 4. It expresses a reversed mapping from an object model to an XML document.

Art Unit: 2122

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection of claim 19 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 4.

As per claims 20-21:

The claims recite a method in which each step is corresponding to the step recited in claims 5-6.

The claims express a reversed mapping from an object model to an XML document.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection of claims 20-21 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claims 5-6.

As per claims 25-28:

The claims recite a method in which each step is corresponding to the step recited in claims 10-13. The claims express reversed a mapping from an object model to an XML document.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection of claims 25-28 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claims 10-13.

As per claims 29-30:

The claims recite a method in which each step is corresponding to the step recited in claims 14-15. The claims express a reversed mapping from an object model to an XML document.

Figure 3, "Dump Relations to XML document", shows the teaching. The rejection of claims 29-30 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claims 14-15.

As per claim 31:

The claim recites a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claim 1. It expresses the mapping either forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation" or "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection of claim 31 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 1.

As per claim 33:

Art Unit: 2122

The claim recites a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claim 3. It expresses the mapping either forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document.

Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation "or" Dump Relations to XML document, shows the teaching. The rejection of claim 33 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 3.

As per claim 34:

The claim recites a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claim 4. The claim limitation expresses the mapping either it is forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation" or "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection of claim 34 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 4.

As per claims 35-36:

The claims recites a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claims 5-6. The claim limitations express the mapping either it is forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document.

Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation "or" Dump Relations to XML document, shows the teaching. The rejection of claims 35-36 is in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 5-6.

As per claim 40:

The claim recites a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claim 10. The claim limitation expresses the mapping either it is forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation" or "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection of claim 40 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 10.

Art Unit: 2122

As per claim 41:

The claim recites a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claim 13. The claim limitation expresses the mapping either it is forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document and between elements and object class.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation" or "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection of claim 41 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 13.

As per claim 42:

The claim recites a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claim 13. The claim limitation expresses the mapping either it is forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document and between one of elements and attribute.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation" or "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection of claim 42 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 13.

As per claim 43:

The claim recites a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claim 13. The claim limitation expresses the mapping either it is forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document and between relationships of elements and objects.

Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation" or "Dump Relations to XML document", shows the teaching. The rejection of claim 43 is in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 13.

As per claim 44: Rundensteiner discloses:

"The manager in claim 31, wherein the object model has one or more classes (See Figure 3, page, lower rectangular box 'Address'. The Relational model context in Figure 3 is a particular one among the Relational Models. See page 59, Figure 2, 'Salaries', another relational Schema/Relational model context), each object class has one or more attributes (Figure 3, lower rectangular box, referring to 'ID 1001'), and the mapping executor includes a mapping unit (Figure 3, for example, the right-hand square

Art Unit: 2122

box, 'Dump Relations') *for creating one or more elements* (Figure 3, for example, the upper rectangular box, <Address> 'element') *corresponding to the attributes ('ID') by inserting values of the attributes* (Figure 3, for example, the lower rectangular box, value '1001') *based on the mapping meta-data* (Figure 3, left-hand rectangular box, 'Mapping XML', right-hand square box, 'Dump Relations').

As per claims 45-46:

The claims recites a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claims 14-15. The claim limitations express the mapping either it is forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation" or "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection of claims 45-46 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 14-15.

As per claim 47:

The claim recites a mapping system for mapping between a markup language document and an object model.

The teaching is shown in Figure 1 (page 58), which is a system form mapping data between markup language document ('XML') and relational ('RDBMS'). It shows the system includes the mapping between "Mapping XML Document to Relation" and "Dumb Relations to XML document (Figure 3, page 60).

The claim has the functionality corresponding to the method as recited in the claim 1.

The rejection of claim 47 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 1.

As per claim 48: The claim recites a mapping system. The teaching is shown in Figure 1 (page 58), wherein the rectangular box, "Middleware" and "Metaknowledge" describe 'a storage'.

As per claim 49:

The claim recites a mapping system. However, the claim functionality is corresponding to the steps recited in Claim 14. The rejection of claim 49 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 14.

Art Unit: 2122

As per claim 50:

The claim recites a mapping system. However, the claim functionality is corresponding to the steps recited in Claim 11. The rejection of claim 50 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 11.

As per claim 51:

The claim recites a mapping system. The three bullets in page 57, teach run-time.

As per claim 52:

The claim recites a mapping system. However, the claim functionality is corresponding to the steps recited in claim 3. The rejection of claim 52 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 3.

As per claim 53: Regarding claim limitation:

"where the object model has one or more object classes, each object class has one or more attributes (See Figure 3, page 60, lower rectangular box "ID"), and the mapping executor includes a mapping unit (Figure 3, left-hand rectangular box or right-hand square box) for creating one or more elements (Figure 3, upper rectangular box, <address>) corresponding to the attributes by inserting values of the attributes (Figure 3, lower rectangular box, ID 1001) based on the mapping meta-data" (See Figure 3, page 60, for example 'ID 1001' corresponding to the element <address> where the values is indicated to the particular element, for example, the element <Address> shown in the upper rectangular based on the Mapping XML Document or Dump Relations).

As per claims 54-55:

The claims recite a mapping system. However, the claim functionality is corresponding to the steps recited in claims 14-15. The rejection of claims 54-55 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claims 14-15.

As per claim 56:

The claim recites Computer readable media. However, the claim functionality is corresponding to the steps recited in Claim 1. The rejection of claim 56 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2122

As per claim 57:

The claim recites Electronic signal for use. However, the claim functionality is corresponding to the steps recited in Claim 1. The rejection of claim 57 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 1.

As per claim 58:

The claim recites a computer program product for use. However, the claim functionality is corresponding to the steps recited in Claim 1. The rejection of claim 58 is in the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 1.

As per claim 59:

The claim recites Computer readable media. However, the claim functionality is corresponding to the steps recited in Claim 16. The rejection of claim 59 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 16.

As per claim 60:

The claim recites Electronic signal for use. However, the claim functionality is corresponding to the steps recited in Claim 16. The rejection of claim 60 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 16.

As per claim 61:

The claim recites a computer program product for use. However, the claim functionality is corresponding to the steps recited in Claim 16. The rejection of claim 61 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 16.

Art Unit: 2122

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 7-9, 17, 22-24, 32, 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rundensteiner et al, in view of Henninger, (US No. 5,499,371).

Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of followed claims in light of the specification.

As per claim 2:

In regard to the limitations of claim 2, Rundensteiner does not explicitly disclose, *"using the key"*.

Henninger discloses, *"using the key"* (Re: Henninger, see column 6, lines 49-67, and column 7, lines 1-26) for identifying data architecture of the mapping target (Re: Henninger, FIG. 2). Thus, the key causes data in the source mapped into the target correspondingly (re: Henninger, see FIG. 2, reference numeral 50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching "using the key" in Henninger to the teaching, mapping request, of Rundensteiner. The motivation is that doing so would prepare an automatically mapping data architecture between mapping sources and mapping targets.

As per claim 7:

In regard to the limitations of claim 7,

Rundensteiner does not explicitly address limitations, *"one element contains a single element containing a pointer to another element"*, and *"an aggregate one-to-one relationship between objects that correspond to the at least one element and the single element"*.

Henninger teaches referencing elements and inheritance relations of elements, and from that it provides an aggregate one-to-one relationship between sources and mapped targets. That discloses *"one element contains a single element containing a pointer to another element"* (Re: Henninger, see column 6, lines 38-48, refer 'The inheritance between employee class and class person' for 'pointer'), and *"an aggregate one-to-one relationship between objects that correspond to the at least one element and the single element"* (Re: Henninger, see FIG. 3, reference numeral 50: for example, element '102' on-to-one to element '114'. Also see FIG. 5B, referring to '1-TO-1', shown from 'RELATIONSHIP' to 'UPDATE FOREIGN KEY ATTRIBUTE BASED ON TRANSFORM 50').

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of pointer (inheritance) and relations of object model in Henninger, that is for referencing elements and corresponding relationships of elements and for describing the corresponding architecture of the source and target into the teaching of Rundensteiner.

The motivation is that doing so would conform to the architectural relations between XML documents and the relational model.

As per claim 8: In regard to the limitations of claim 8,

Rundensteiner does not explicitly address limitations, *"and the multiple elements into attributes of the object model that represent one-to-many relationships between objects that correspond to the at least one element and the multiple elements"*.

Henninger teaches referencing elements and inheritance relations of elements, and from that it provides an aggregate one-to-many relationship of mapped targets. That discloses such limitations (Re: Henninger, see FIG 5B, refer '1-TO-MANY', shown from 'RELATIONSHIP' to 'MANY-SIDE' or 'ONE-SIDE').

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of pointer (inheritance) and relations of object model in Henninger, that is for referencing elements and corresponding relationships of elements and for describing the corresponding architecture of the source and target into the teaching of Rundensteiner.

The motivation is that doing so would conform to the architectural relations between XML documents and the relational model.

As per claim 9:

Rundensteiner does not explicitly address limitations, *"one element contains multiple elements containing pointer to another elements"*, and *"an aggregate one-to-many relationships between objects that correspond to the at least one element and the multiple element"*.

Henninger teaches referencing elements and inheritance relations of elements. and from that it provides an aggregate one-to-one relationship of mapped targets. That discloses *"one element contains multiple elements containing pointer to another elements"* (Re: Henninger, see column 6, lines 38-48, 'The inheritance between employee class and class person'), and *"an aggregate one-to-many relationships between objects that correspond to the at least one element and the multiple element"* (Re: Henninger, see FIG. 3, reference numeral 50: for example, element '108' is one-to-many to elements '119' and '120'. Also see FIG 5B, referring to '1-TO-MANY', shown from 'RELATIONSHIP' to 'MANY-SIDE' or 'ONE-SIDE').

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of pointer (inheritance) and relations of object model in Henninger, that is for referencing elements and corresponding relationships of elements and for describing the corresponding architecture of the source and target into the teaching of Rundensteiner.

The motivation is that doing so would conform to the architectural relations between XML documents and the relational model.

As per claim 17:

The claim recites a method in which each step is corresponding to the step recited in claim 2. It expresses a reversed mapping from an object model to an XML document.

Art Unit: 2122

Figure 3, "Dump Relations to XML document", shows the teaching. The rejection/motivation has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 2.

As per claims 22-24:

The claims recite a method in which each step is corresponding to the step recited in claims 7-9. The claims express a reversed mapping from an object model to an XML document.

Figure 3, "Dump Relations to XML document", shows the teaching. The rejection/motivation has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claims 7-9.

As per claim 32:

The claim recites a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claim 2. The claim limitation expresses the mapping either it is forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation" or "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection/motivation of claim 32 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 2.

As per claims 37-39:

The claims recite a mapping manager that manages the method as correspondingly recited in Claims 7-9. The claim limitations express the mapping either it is forwarding or reversed between an object model and an XML document.

The teaching is shown in Figure 3, "Mapping XML Document to Relation" or "Dump Relations to XML document". The rejection/motivation of claims 37-39 has the same reason as set forth in connecting to the rejection of claim 7-9.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ted T. Vo whose telephone number is (703) 308-9049. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM ET. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on (703) 305-4552.

The fax phone numbers:

(703) 872-9306 (for formal communication intended for entry);

(703) 746-5429 (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TTV

Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2122
July 8, 2004